UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,		Case No. CR 17 - 231 WHA	
	Plaintiff,) v.)	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT	
1 :	sive Faofiu	MAY 092017	
O,	Pive Foofiu) Defendant.)	SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT	
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on May 9, 2017, the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from May 9, 2017 to			
Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).			
	The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).		
	Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).		
<u> </u>		nably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given taking into account the exercise of due diligence.	
	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).		
	IT IS SO ORDERED.	Allph	
DATED: 5/9/17 WANG-EVNE JUNES JOSEPH C. SPERO			
STIPUI	LATED: MACONIA	Chief Magistrate Judge	
	Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney	